

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LYNN ODRICK

Plaintiff(s),

v.

UNION BANCAL CORP., ET AL.

Defendant(s).

CASE NO. C 10-05565-SBA

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

Court Processes:

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)
- ☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)
- ☒ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR, must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

- ☒ Private ADR (*please identify process and provider*) mediation

Parties are in the process of selecting a private mediator.

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

- ☐ the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)
- ☒ other requested deadline September 30, 2011

Dated: 2/22/2011

Michael Morrison

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: 2/22/2011

Eric Steinert

Attorney for Defendant

When filing this document in ECF, please be sure to use the appropriate ADR Docket Event, e.g., "Stipulation and Proposed Order Selecting Early Neutral Evaluation."

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration
- ☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE)
- ☒ Mediation
- ☐ Private ADR

Deadline for ADR session

- ☐ 90 days from the date of this order.
- ☒ other September 30, 2011

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/1/11



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michael S. Morrison, an employee of the City of Santa Monica, certify that on February 22, 2011, caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED ORDER] SELECTING ADR PROCESS** to be filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following counsel who has registered for receipt of documents filed in this matter:

<u>Counsel for Defendants</u> Eric M. Steinert, Esq. Justin T. Curley, Esq. SEYFARTH SHAW LLP 560 Mission Street, Suite 3100 San Francisco, California 94105 T: 415 397 2823 F: 415 397 8549 E: esteinert@seyfarth.com E: jcurley@seyfarth.com	
---	--

The aforementioned document(s) have been served by mail on the following parties:

Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs

Cory H. Hurwitz, Esq.
Douglas B. Hayes, Esq.
Hurwitz Orihuela & Hayes, LLP
10 Universal City, 20th Floor
Universal City, California 91608
T: 818 753 2381 | F: 818 753 2382
E: chh@hohlawyers.com | E: dbh@hohlawyers.com

ALEXANDER KRAKOW + GLICK LLP

/s/

MICHAEL S. MORRISON
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Attorneys for Plaintiff LYNN ODRICK
individually, on behalf of all others similarly
situated, and the general public